

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the Official Action of August 16, 2004, relating to the above-identified application.

Claims 1 and 4 have been amended in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim applicants' contribution to the art and to specify that the arrangement pattern is within a finely adjustable range which is adjusted by an image transformation. Basis is found in the application *inter alia* on page 19, lines 21, *et seq.*

New Claims 32 and 33 are patterned after original Claims 1 and 2 and represent an alternative definition of the claimed invention.

The rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 7, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as anticipated by *Masaaki* (JP 08-276787) is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Masaaki discloses a structure for correcting the deviation of a camera position by image processing and calculates the deviation amount by photographing a correcting mark and comparing it with a reference position where the correcting mark supposedly lies.

In contrast, a feature of the present invention which is now clearly expressed in the claims is for judging whether or not the camera can be included within a finely adjustable range which is adjusted by an image transformation with respect to the deviation of the camera position.

Masaaki does not disclose this method for judging whether or not the camera is set within this fine adjustable range. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 points out the patentable difference between the present invention and the device shown in the reference.

Moreover, the cited reference does not clearly disclose a structure for displaying a photographed image having a judgment pattern on the display device. Further, in *Masaaki*, the display device displays only the imaging processing result, and an object of *Masaaki* is to calculate the correcting amount. Therefore, in the description concerning Figure 7 of *Masaaki*, there is provided an explanation for calculating the correcting amount. *Masaaki* does not disclose a structure for displaying the comparison of the photographed image and the reference value. For these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference of *Masaaki* does not anticipate the claimed subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b); and, therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Takano* (US 5,850,254) is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Takano discloses a structure for detecting and correcting the deviation of a camera position. However, the reference discloses only the coincidence with the reference value and does not disclose the structure for judging whether or not the camera is set within the above-mentioned fine adjustable range, as now set forth in Claim 4.

Claim 4 has been amended to more particularly point out the distinguishing features of the claimed invention and therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 4 is not anticipated by the cited reference.

With respect to Claim 8, *Takano* discloses a structure for warning with respect to the deviation of the camera position. It is respectfully submitted that since Claim 8 depends on Claim 4, it is believed that the reference no longer anticipates the claimed subject matter and, therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Fujii* (US 6,020,919), further in view of *Tomitaka* (US 5,355,163), is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The *Fujii* document discloses the inspection of a display device while *Tomitaka* discloses a method for the automatic focusing of a camera. However, the Office Action fails to set forth an explanation of any motivation for combining the *Tomitaka* structure with the device of *Fujii*. Furthermore, neither of the cited references show the adjustment of the finely adjustable range as recited in Claim 4 on which Claim 5 depends.

It is respectfully submitted that the Official Action fails to establish any reason, suggestion or motivation for modifying the *Fujii* device based on the disclosure of *Tomitaka*. Neither is there any basis in the combination of references that would lend a person skilled in the art to expect that any improvement could be obtained with respect to the *Fujii* device by incorporating the features of *Tomitaka*. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness for Claims 5 and 6.

The rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of *Fujii* (US 6,020,919), further in view of *Hamaguri* (US 6,462,777), is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Official Action fails to establish any reason, suggestion or motivation why a person skilled in the art would be lead to modify the *Fujii* device with the features of *Hamaguri* as there has been no discussion of any expectation of improved results flowing from the combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of references fails to make out a

App. No. 09/665,950
Amend. dated Nov. 12, 2004
Resp. to Office Action dated Aug. 12, 2004


case of *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention and, therefore, the rejection based thereon should be withdrawn.

The indication of allowable subject matter with respect to Claim 9 is noted with appreciation. Applicants have rewritten Claim 9 as an independent claim including the features of Claims 4 and 8.

In view of the foregoing, favorable action at the Examiner's earliest convenience is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: 
Robert G. Weilacher, Reg. No. 20,531

Suite 3100, Promenade II
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3592
Telephone: (404) 815-3593
Facsimile: (404) 685-6893